Dear Dave, 6/20/91

We have retrained from a long and tiring day, this time Lil more tired and with a delayed supper I can write. The check on my eye at Hopkins was good and on the legs OK but only on the basis of adequate blood pressure. Which I hope is enough!

And I have to go back Monday. There is a new experimental treatment for reducing the size on an enlarged prostate. The hematologist who has been so very helpful to me made an appointment for me. Unfortunately, not with the men involved in the reported used there. But because it is apparent that the job will have to be done again, any cutting representing a special problem to me, I am happy to be in a position to make the request and suggest that I am the kind of petient who can expand the potential usefulness of the new medicine, really not a medicine but I don't know the correct term.

So I've lost a day, soon will lose another, and today's mail alone is a stack.

I am therefore more hurried in commenting on your porposed letter to the Journal of History. Which I believe you wrote in too great haste from some of the things I picked up. I read her crap first, with a highlighter, then read your letter.

Most of all I believe you should begin with the ending, with the addition I've noted, on what the true historian is.

Then I think you should go into the unwisdom of the concept. It meant inevitably that history consists of the official mythology, with an attempt at balance by including unofficial mythologies in a minor role. I don't know that want to include it but you did not mention the Texas Court of Inquiry.

I think your should say that this article, the ignorance of basic fact reflected in it and in the editing which did not pick that error up, is the unfortunate reality of the failure of professional historians to make the required inquiry and in this perpetuate the official mythology, thus disgracing the profession and the nation,

To whom did they send this with any factual knowledge, which is supposed to be the practise - nobody. any authentic subject expert would have seen the errors and flaws. Is that the way to run the Journal Of History? Did it not trivialize the subject?

This is too long and with too much of less than great significance. Is Moorman that important to jeopardize appearance?

On page 5 I can't follow what is highlighted.

Her article, 268, referring that that tinselled proprgandizing of the official mythology as "the Memory of the Nation" of JFK is obscene and indecent. If those who created it did not know of the substantial information disproving the official story there were ignorant and could not have implimented serious, historical purposes. If they were not this ignorant, then there we no more than propagandists or community commercializers exploiting the word "history" in the name they took.

269, the author "who thinks and writes about history", perish the thought with this as an illustration,, apparently does not remember history, like of Gallileo and the Salem

witches and how often officials have been so very wrong. She proceeds to misuse history by saying that "official investigations determined" that Oswald fired all the shots from there. They did no such thing. They theorized, or concluded but they did not and could not "determine" what was false. For example, the FBI and the Secret Service both disagree with the Commission's conslusions that the first shot struck both JFK and Connally.

What kind of "scholars" could the NEH have "brought together" who had the faintest knowledge of the fact of the official investigations and the disproofs? None!

"Clothes dryers and air conditioning" were then not "innovations" for most Americans. Both were "innovated decades earlier and were in common use.

270 "glass bubble."

As I recall, it was not "a group of conservative businessmen" who took the ad out. Instead they paid the costs of the ad prepared by extreme extremists, who "took it out."

Moorman did not take her picture "as a bullet struck the President's head." One ought ask why she or the exhibit says this when it is so clearly seen on Z 313.

271 Altgens was not a "itness standing" in Dealey Plaza, He was an AP photographer who mved around in taking them and took one of the most important of the still pictures.

There was only one "fatal shot". She says "shots."

272. The "area" does not address the "the investigations." It is basically the lone-nut assassin official investigations and the irresponsible conspiracy theorizings, which are not investigations, Moreover, one of the official investigations, HSCA, concluded that there had been a conspiracy. I think you noted that she calls commissions committees and committees commissions.. (I emphasizing ignorance as historical expertise.)

"Exhibition planners do not embrace one particular view." The hell they don't. They pretened that there is nothing other than official and unofficial mythologies

273. How in the world could it be possible for that exhibit to "assist future historians to interpret the meaning of this part of history to our nation and the world" when it is so insubstantial, so faulted, and does not address any of the many consequences of that assassination, which had the effect of a coup d'etat in any event?

I'm returning both you draft and her crap so you can see the highlightings and notes. When you are finised I'd like a copy of each for file.

I'm also enclosing a copy of an archeological article sent by a friend who had earler reported the finding of rocks engraved in Hebrew with the decalogue prior to Columbus. When you have read them, if it interests you, please send to my friend Rabbi S.M.Silver, 2475 West Atlantic Ave., Delray Beach, FL 33445. He may have some knowledge of those findings and might tell us.

Best to all,

Harold